

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 12-28 are presently active in this case. The present Amendment amends Claims 12-23; and adds Claims 24-28.

The outstanding Office Action objected to the specification because of informalities. Claims 12-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Shuman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,161,071).

In response to the objection to the specification, the specification is amended to include the appropriate headings. In light of their formal nature, the changes to the specification do not raise a question of new matter.

In order to clarify Applicant's invention, the claims are amended to comply better with U.S. claim drafting practice.

In order to vary the scope of protection recited in the claims, new Claims 24-28 are added. New Claims 24-28 find non-limiting support in the disclosure as originally filed, for example at page 9, last four paragraphs; and at page 13, second paragraph.

Therefore, the changes to the claims are not believed to raise a question of new matter.¹

In response to the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this rejection and traverses the rejection, as discussed next.

Briefly recapitulating, Applicant's invention, as recited in independent Claim 12, relates to a method for diagnosing functional faults of a functional architecture that includes

¹ See MPEP 2163.06 stating that "information contained in any one of the specification, claims or drawings of the application as filed may be added to any other part of the application without introducing new matter."

functions for performing a service and associated with sensors and actuators that produce and consume data. The method includes the steps of creating a first *list of particular values corresponding to functional faults of the sensors and actuators*; and creating a second *list of particular values that permit propagation of information relating to said functional faults of said sensors and actuators across the functional architecture*. The method further includes a step of formulating a functional diagnosis of the service based on the first and second lists of particular values, and a step of recording the particular values and their propagation on a memory device. Examples of values that permit propagation of the information relating to the functional faults are now claimed in new dependent Claims 24-28. They include values associated with the presence of a connection fault between the sensors and actuators, such as a short-circuit, a cut electrical wire, or a faulty connector.

Turning now to the applied prior art, the Shuman et al. patent discloses a computing architecture for a motorized land-based vehicle. The computing architecture includes a data network including processors, sensors responsive to environmental conditions around the vehicle, sensors responsive to the vehicle's hardware systems, and a map database containing data that represent geographic features in the geographic area around the vehicle. A vehicle-environment modeling program, executed on the data network, uses the outputs from the sensors and the map database to provide a data model that represents the vehicle and the environmental around the vehicle, including geographic features, conditions, structures, objects and obstacles around the vehicle.

However, the Shuman et al. patent fails to disclose the claimed method for diagnosing functional faults of a functional architecture. In particular, the Shuman et al. patent fails to disclose the claimed steps of creating a *list of particular values corresponding to functional faults of the sensors and actuators*, as well as another *list of particular values that permit propagation of information relating to these functional faults across a functional*

architecture, as required by amended Claim 12. The Office Action points to Shuman et al.'s column 12, lines 62-64 and column 13, lines 1-5. These passages relate to the driver assistance applications 224 that includes warning system applications 224(7). See also Fig. 6. The warning system applications 224(7) includes a *curve* warning application 224(7)(2), and a *fire* warning application 224(3)(4). Thus, these passages clearly do not disclose the creation of a list of values corresponding to functional faults of *sensors and actuators*, nor a list of values that *permit propagation* of information relating to these functional faults across a functional architecture. While the Shuman et al. patent discloses that certain data and information is propagated through the vehicle network, the information relating for example to the presence of a curve on the road or of a fire in the vehicle, the Shuman et al. patent fails to disclose the listing of values corresponding to the functional faults of *sensors and actuators*, much less the listing of *values that permit propagation of information relating to such functional faults*. Therefore, the prior art fails to disclose every feature recited in Applicant's claims, so that Claims 12-23 are not anticipated by the prior art. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully traverses, and requests reconsideration of, the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejection based on the Shuman et al. patent.²

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal Allowance. A Notice of Allowance for Claims 12-28 is earnestly solicited.


² See MPEP 2131: "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference," (Citations omitted) (emphasis added). See also MPEP 2143.03: "All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art."

Application No. 10/539,128
Reply to Office Action of January 4, 2008

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Philippe J.C. Signore, Ph.D.
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 43,922

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)